

ing from another sum now in course of collection under the name of the Compensation Fund, the object of which is to supply the deficiency caused by the somewhat discreditable withdrawal of the biennial Government grant of £1200. That grant, extended over two years, sufficed to raise the incomes of the Bishops (Argyll being again excepted,) to £230 per annum; and it is hoped that, when the subscription to the present fund shall be closed, the supply arising from it will not fall far short of that amount. As yet, however, the scheme is far from completion. The subscriptions are scarcely more than half paid up; in some cases necessarily so, as their payment was to extend through several years; and the entire interest of the sum accruing from it, to each see, from the commencement of any payment to the present time, is £17, Argyll again excepted. At present, therefore, the income of the Bishop is barely £160.

These facts should speak for themselves. It is, of course, utterly impossible for a Bishop even to live, far more to discharge the duties of his position and office as he ought, on such a pittance as this. He is called on imperatively to take his place, socially as well as ecclesiastically, at the head of his Diocese—to use hospitality—to welcome his clergy—and to receive strangers. He is required to do this now far more imperatively, and more largely, than a few years since when the Church was a smaller body. The power of doing this affects, to a very large extent, his influence and authority in his Diocese. He has to do with the wealthier classes who must be met on equal terms. He has, moreover, very heavy expenses to meet, arising from his ecclesiastical position. He has Synods to attend and proceedings to pay for. The cost of all this must come from his private purse or be charged upon his income as Bishop; and, as the experience of the last two years has proved, this may almost wholly swallow up the meagre maintenance allowed him. At this very time, we believe, a sum of £26 has been, or is about to be, deducted from the amount, as regards the six Bishops, to defray the expenses incurred in the proceedings instituted against the Bishop of Brechin, at the demand, and in the service, of the Church.

And what has been, and is still, the result of this? That Bishops have either been almost necessarily chosen, in some measure, with a regard to those private means which might make their Episcopate more effective, or else that they have been obliged themselves to supplement their inadequate means of living by assuming the ministerial charge of some large and influential congregation within their Dioceses.

And can either of these courses be desirable?

Happily the possession of private means has hitherto been a point for which the Church has only to be most truly thankful. She has sacrificed nothing for it. That recommendation has been much more than equalled by others of higher character, and the result, therefore, has been only that of a double gain. But it is impossible to defend the principle of such a choice, however we may be compelled to adopt it. There ought to be no one point—no one consideration influencing the selection but that of personal claim and fitness.

So again with ministerial charges. It cannot be denied that such a system is wholly contrary to the design and character of the Episcopate. The Diocese should be the Bishop's congregation—not one especial flock in it—and the want of this arrangement must influence, and has influenced greatly for evil, the operation of Episcopal authority.

In the first place, as things are now constituted in our congregations, the Bishop becomes the

charge, we may almost say, the property, of a part of his allotted district only. His own flock support, and are, therefore, left to support him. His claim on the care and support of the whole Diocese is forgotten. He stands, so far, in the position of the Diocesan clergy—recognised as a charge, and maintained, only by his immediate people.

Then, must not this position interfere, from its very nature, with the true character of the Episcopate? Can it be fitting for one who should be independent of all personal interest in the favour of his people, to depend on the uncertain and often wayward feelings of a congregation, or, it might be, of a vestry, for his support? It is well for one who is, ecclesiastically, the head of all, to be practically a mere servant? The position of the clergy generally, in a voluntarily supported Church, is far from satisfactory, but it is directly opposed to the office and character of a Bishop. And how can he devote the care that is necessary to the affairs of the Church—how can he be present continually as an overseer in the different parts of his Diocese—and how be prepared to deal with the graver duties and weightier business of the Church at large, if unceasing Sunday services and parochial work in one place are always pressing on him? Where can he find the time for his peculiar work.

These are all serious considerations: they affect the very life of our Church; for unless the head be sound, there can be no health or vigour in the body. And it is with true satisfaction, therefore, that we have observed the move now made, by the laymen of the Diocese of St. Andrew's, for the better maintenance of their Bishop. It is a move which does the promoters the greatest honour, and one which, if followed up, will do more to redeem our Church from difficulties than any step which has been taken for centuries. Place the episcopate on a right footing, and you gain the fulcrum for the lever—the support of all efforts. You must give power to the driving wheel if you would make machinery effective. And at present we have not done this: we have set other wheels in motion—"wheels within wheels" in some cases—but they have wanted that impelling, sustaining, and correcting action, which can alone give union of effort and stability of purpose to the whole.

The course proposed by the memorialists is, if we understand them rightly, the formation of a Diocesan Endowment Fund; and, pending this, the Bishop's income is to be augmented at once, by a special annual offertory. Nothing can be better than this arrangement. A permanent endowment is, of course, the point to be aimed at; but the progress of such schemes is slow: and it is a great thing to do something at once—both to supply the deficiency now existing and to bind ourselves down to the principle of such an effort.

That principle, too, is admirably supported by the adoption of special diocesan offertories. These are the very channels through which the stream should flow. The Bishop is thus recognised, throughout the district over which he has been made overseer, as entitled to the support of all and many are enabled as well as reminded, to give of their scantier means—possibly, even, of their "deep poverty"—who, though anxious to bear in some measure the burthens of the Church and to testify their affection for their chief shepherds could not take part in regular subscription schemes. It was the way, of old, for this to be done, more especially at *Easter Tide*: and for the amount then gathered, to bear the name of *Easter Offering*; and why should not these, now, be made the occasion and name of a general yearly offering to the Chief Pastors of our Holy Church; partly, perhaps, for the supply of their present

needs, and partly towards the increase of an otherwise accruing fund for the permanent endowment of their sees?

At any rate, we trust most earnestly that the example so nobly set forth by the laymen of the Diocese of St. Andrew's may provoke very many to a like exertion. All honour to them, both for their discernment and their zeal! They have struck the point on which, above all others, the welfare of our Church depends, and they have done so with an energy and unitedness of aim and feeling which leaves nothing to be desired but that all should follow the course in which they have so nobly led.

*Extract from the Address to the Synod of St. Andrew's, by the Right Reverend Bishop Dodsworth:—*

With respect to the business that is to come before us now, I received on Wednesday last a printed circular from Mr. Milne, the Synod clerk, informing me—as you have no doubt been all similarly informed—that "the Rev. G. H. Forbes is desirous of moving the adoption of a resolution that there should be in every congregation of the diocese an annual offertory for the Bishop."

"What I feel is—first, that the motion is scarcely one to be discussed in the presence of the Bishop himself, except it be upon the understanding that it is to be regarded solely with the view of making necessary provision for the maintenance and discharge of the episcopal office; and, secondly, I feel that your experience on the former occasion, when the same resolution, though passed, as I have said, at a meeting of clergy, (from which I was absent,) led to no practical results, should induce you now to put the matter in a different shape; I mean that, whereas a number of the principal laymen of the diocese have now taken up the proposal, you should rather throw your resolution into such a form as to express your willingness (if indeed you are willing) to co-operate with them in what they have already done, and in what they are proposing to do further. I have every reason to believe that the laity (upon whom the success of the measure, and even the introduction of it at all, in some instances, must entirely depend) are desirous to show to you, in regard to it, all proper respect, and would wish not to proceed without your concurrence. The proposal is no doubt an important one, not merely or mainly in relation to my own personal interest (indeed, I need scarcely say, the less it is regarded as a personal question, the better,) but as likely, I trust, if carried into effect, to strengthen the cause of the Church in various ways throughout the diocese. For this reason, I am sure that both the mover of the proposed resolution and the Synod in general will take in good part the remarks which I have ventured to make concerning it.

#### VERNACULAR BIBLE IN RUSSIA.

We have frequently alluded to the providential indications that the Greek Church is to play an important part in bringing in the latter-day glory of the Gospel. The (London) *Clerical Journal* extracts from the St. Petersburg paper, *Le Nord*, an account of a project recently set on foot in Russia for providing a vernacular edition of the Holy Scriptures, to replace the Slavonic version now in use. We give the latter part of the statement, which is made by a Moscow correspondent:—

The first to raise this question in our day was Philarrates, the Metropolitan of Moscow. At the coronation of the Emperor Alexander, when most